



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,475	01/14/2004	Stephen G. Perlman	6181P506	5867
8791 7590 07/08/2008 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
KEEFE, MICHAEL E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,475

Applicant(s)

PERLMAN ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL E. KEEFER

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed 3/3/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh et al. (US 2002/0138581), hereafter MacIntosh.

Regarding **claims 1, 8, and 15**, MacIntosh discloses:

A method for filtering unwanted email messages comprising:

defining a plurality of disposable email addresses, wherein each of the disposable email addresses is associated with a different Website and/or individual; (abstract, an email address ... automatically associated with the web page)

in response to detecting a particular Website being visited by an end user, automatically providing the user with one or more disposable email address options from which to select. ([0070]-[0071] disclose providing the user with a disposable email address to select in response to detecting a website being visited by a user.)

automatically entering the disposable email address within a data field on the Website upon selection of the data entry field with a cursor control device. (MacIntosh discloses a user "dragging" an address from a second window to a first window. (See paragraph 72, also Applicant's remarks, page 2, second

paragraph) This, read broadly, means that when the field is selected by the cursor control device (i.e. the email address is dragged to it) the address is automatically copied into the field.)

Regarding **claims 3 and 10 as applied to claims 1 and 8**, MacIntosh discloses:

if a disposable email address is not already associated with the Website, at least one of the disposable email address options comprises an option to automatically generate a disposable email address for the Website. ([0070]-[0071] disclose providing the user with a disposable email address to select in response to detecting a website being visited by a user.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 4-5 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh as applied to claims 1-3 and 8-10 above, and further in view of Friend (US 2004/0153512).

MacIntosh discloses all the limitations of claims 4-5 and 11-12 except for generating the email address by combining a domain name and a base email address.

The general concept of combining a domain name with a base email address is well known in the art as taught by Friend. (see at least Fig. 9 and [0061])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine MacIntosh with the general concept of combining a domain name with a base email address as taught by Friend in order to allow a user to more readily identify what account an email address is used with.

5. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh and Friend as applied to claims 1-4 and 8-11 above, and further in view of Gautier (US 2004/0045031).

MacIntosh and Friend teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 13 except for the addition of a number to a pre-existing email address.

The general concept of adding a number to a pre-existing address is well known in the art as taught by Gautier. ([0009] teaches adding a number to an existing email address)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify MacIntosh and Friend with the general concept of adding a number to a pre-existing address as taught by Gautier in order to make unique email addresses.

6. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh and Friend as applied to claims 1-4 and 8-11 above, and further in view of Hall (US 2004/0205173).

MacIntosh and Friend teach all the limitations of claims 7 and 14 except for adding a random number with a string to create an email address.

The general concept of adding a random number to a string to create an email address is well known in the art as taught by Hall. ([0011] teaches appending a string with a random number to create an email address.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify MacIntosh and Friend with the general concept of adding a random

number to a string to create an email address as taught by Hall in order to reduce unsolicited emails.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. The Examiner has pointed out where the limitations added to the independent claims can be found in Macintosh in the above rejections of claims 1, 8 and 15. However, even if Applicant's argument that Macintosh teaches manually copying an address from a second window to the current window instead of automatically entering the e-mail address is correct, this difference is not patentable as it is merely automating a previously manual process. (See MPEP 2144.04 Section III, "The court held that broadly providing an automatic ... means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result [in this case, placing an e-mail address in a field] is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art.")

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2154

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 6/17/2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Application/Control Number: 10/758,475

Page 7

Art Unit: 2154

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2146